

D-6395

L

D-6398

SHANGHAI MUNICIPAL POLICE.

S.2, Special Branch ~~RECORDED~~

REPORT

Date, January 31, 1935.

Subject (in full) Translation of article appearing in the "Novosty Dnia" of 31, 1934.

Made **xx**

and

Forwarded to

D. T. Ross

I forward herewith for information translation of an article entitled "10,000 miles around divorce," which appeared in the Novosty Dnia of December 31, 1934, relating to the divorce case of Davidson v. Davidson which was heard in H.B.I.L. Supreme Court on December 28, 1934.

DBK

D. T.

Translation made by S.S. Brokofis.

DBK 31

Deputy Commissioner,
Special Branch.

DB. (S.)

Information.

J.W.
WJ 5/1 File J.W.



Translation of feuilleton which appears in the "NOVOSTY DNIA"
of December 31, 1934.

10,000 MILES AROUND DIVORCE

Excuse my indelicate question:

Perhaps your wife wishes to be divorced from you?

She does?

In that case excuse me for asking another indelicate question:

Do you wish to oblige your wife by consenting to a divorce? You don't?

In that case the following lines are at your service.

You will find in them all what you need!

x x
 x

Now we can proceed with our feuilleton in a negligent manner, without paying any attention whatever to style.

Everything will be pardoned! And everything will be read!

It will be simply impossible to prevent a reader, especially a female reader, from reading our feuilleton. Not even if you strike them with a stick. Not even by pouring cold water over them from a fire hose. Nothing can drive them away from such a subject!

Such is the secret power of printed word, the mystery of literary magics, the "Open Sesame!" to the treasure of purely literary joys!

So you do not wish to be your wife's benefactor, do you?

You are not going to grant her the so much desired divorce? Splendid!

Then what are you supposed to do?

Nothing special! Absolutely nothing! Just keep on going about with your hands deep in the pockets of your trousers.

What? Your wife does not waste time? She is taking steps?

Possibly!

But you need not worry about it!

What can happen to you? An hotel incident at the worst!

Supposing you fancy to visit an hotel in Shanghai without any special purpose.

Very well! Why not?

You simply go there and that's that!

It is true that you do not go there alone but, for instance, in company with a lady, whose identity is nobody's business.

Splendid!

After a little time, quite of a sudden, somebody knocks at the door of your room.

Very good!

Go and open the door immediately.

What shall you see?

You will see the face of a paid detective from a private detective agency. The detective, of course, will see you.

Suppose, he sees that you are in your pyjamas. He will, perhaps, look with his detective's eyes into the room and notice your lady. He will even observe that she, too, is in her pyjamas. May be he even will notice that not only is she in pyjamas, but in bed as well.

Maskee!

The main thing is - don't be afraid!

Quietly puff a cloud of tobacco smoke right in the face of the detective and say:

"So you are the paid one, my dear fellow? You get money for this kind of business? Is it really your fate that I must kick you out of here right now? What a pity! But I have already submitted to my cruel fate. Get out!"

And that is that!

Then there will be a court, where the following will take place:

The paid detective will appear and tell the court about his impressions when visiting your room.

One will listen to him.

Then your wife's lawyer will get up and deliver a thundering speech against you.

One will listen to him too.

Then you will rise and, if your head is filled with brains and not with some useless stuff, you will say:

"Qu'est-ce que ce? Why have I been dragged in here? You had better issue an order to have all hotels in Shanghai pulled down right away! Indeed, if one cannot for one's own money engage a room in one of these hotels, without being prosecuted for doing so, then what the hell is the use of hotels? Did I forge banknotes in that room? Or receive stolen property? Or was I caught in the act of cutting to pieces a dead body in order to send it in a trunk to Japan? Nothing of the sort!

I only see that my wife wishes a divorce. Why? Because I was in my pyjamas? Or because a wee darling was also in her pyjamas and, being indisposed,^{w^{as}}, resting in her bed?

One will listen to you.

And from this moment the law is in your favour.

The law, of course, is strict!

But, according to law, what are the causes for divorce?
Breach of conjugal fidelity!

There is nothing in law to show that being in company with a lady is sufficient cause for divorce. Even if one is in one's pyjamas, in company with a charming little darling. Even if she, too, is in her pyjamas and is not merely sitting, but sort of lying in a bed, on account of her being generally indisposed.

The law, you see, does not enter into such trifling details. What have all these hotel rooms, pyjamas, and darlings to do with the law?

The law wants a breach of conjugal fidelity, nothing short of a breach of conjugal fidelity!

As to the hotel pyjamas, personal impressions of detectives regarding the beauties of your lady and her perfectly natural pose - all this is only material for a newspaper feuilleton.....

x x
x

Your wife's lawyer will have to listen to the judge's cruel judgement:-

Petition for divorce cannot be granted on the ground of a paid detective's narrative only regarding this gentleman being in company with his friend in pyjamas. Many people in Shanghai prefer this kind of dress, especially during the hot season. Reference to the hotel is also not convincing - an hotel is a public place. Have you anything else to say? You have not? Then be so kind not to bother us in future because of pyjamas. This is a court of law and not a Hollywood newspaper office. Amen!

The case is finished and you leave the court room carrying your head high. And immediately you will go to a telephone.

"Is that you, darling? Congratulate me on continuation of my happy family life, which has withstood such a serious trial, ^{and} ~~as~~ a paid detective's admiration of your plastic beauty and pyjamas.

By the way, come at once to the same room, to the same hotel! We shall drink to my conjugal fidelity! And don't forget to take your pyjamas with you!"

DIVORCE ACTION HALTED

Evidence of Detective Not Satisfactory

"I do not regard the witness as reliable. He is a paid detective, and I look upon his evidence with great suspicion," said Judge A. G. Mossop in H.M. Supreme Court yesterday morning, commenting on the evidence of the one witness in a petition for a divorce in the case of K. W. Davidson vs. R. H. Davidson.

The petitioner, Mrs. Kathleen Winifred Davidson, represented by Mr. M. Blumfield Brown of Messrs. Platt White-Cooper & Co., asked for a decree nisi to be granted from the respondent and the custody of their three children. Mr. Brown told Judge Mossop that the petitioner was living at present in British Columbia, Canada, having been separated from her husband since May 4, 1932. She petitioned for a divorce on information given to her by her solicitors, Messrs. Platt, White-Cooper & Co. In support of the petition Mr. Brown read out an affidavit signed by the petitioner.

The respondent, Mr. Robert Huntley Davidson is a chartered accountant at present resident in Shanghai. He appeared in court yesterday having been subpoenaed by Mr. Brown for the purpose of giving evidence of being domiciled in China. Mr. Ronald G. McDonald held a watching brief on behalf of the respondent.

The only witness called yesterday was a Russian detective who was detailed to watch and report on the movements of the respondent. In his evidence he stated that the alleged adultery took place at the Embassy Hotel on the night of July 14. The name of the woman with whom the respondent was alleged to have committed adultery was not disclosed in court yesterday.

Judge Mossop commenting on the evidence of the detective said to Mr. Brown: "I am not satisfied in this particular case. All I have is this man's story without any corroboration. You have to satisfy me if this did not take place on July 14, and I, sitting as a jury, am not satisfied." Judge Mossop said he was quite willing to adjourn the case sine die or if Mr. Brown preferred he would dismiss the petition and leave Mr. Brown as representing the petitioner, the option to appeal. At the start of proceedings Mr. Brown said the petition was not defended. Judge Mossop pointed out this point was a moot one, and whether the petition was defended or not, the onus of proof was on the petitioner.

Mr. Brown asked Judge Mossop for the case to be adjourned sine die.

Extract of Proceedings in S. S. D. Court for L.L.C. 19 F. I. R. No. 7/35 Stn. No. 73/6-35

Reg. No. 6/73043/6 Stn. 1014 New

Procurator

Judge

heet 10.

Proceedings ~~except~~ in Kuri for the . . .
Supt. Vinh Phu of the . . ., a dispatch has been sent
to the P. C. for the handing over of the accused. It is stated
that the arrest was effected on 1. 12. 4 at 11 a.m. on the 1st of December
in the afternoon which contained secret writing and that it
was delivered in one solution when writing appeared. The bulletins
contained instructions to the communists in the power of the accused
to carry on their plan. And this is all that the accused were asked to do in
writing. He did not say anything else.

Witness:- No. 1 age: 25 years a Communist and gave
now his true name as follows. Name: Le Van Giai. He further
stated that he was born in Hanoi. When he was 12 years old he went
to the mountainous region of Vietnam to work in the forest. He worked for
four years. After the four years he returned to Hanoi and became a member of the
Communist Party. He was a member of the Party for about two years. At that time he
delivered letters to the communists in the Party. At that time the
Party was under the command of Com. Pham Van Trach. At that time he
participated in the Party and he also had a statement in a report for the
Party. He never met the accused and although he did not give him
money or gifts etc. I know the accused from public talk. I first saw him
about 1930 and I only gave him some 2 francs. He never do to know.

1st acc:- I do not know this witness and have never seen him.
I only arrived in Hanoi.

2nd acc:- I do not know this witness. I came from Ningbo and
was on my way to Hanoi. I went to borrow some money from a friend
but he did not find him.

3rd acc:- I am not a Communist, the things found in my place
belong to my friend.

4th acc:- I do not know as such. I came to Hanoi to look
for employment.

Decision

Accused to be handed over together with seized property
to Shanghai Public Safety Bureau.
(Handed over on 12/1/35).

863161. J.H.S.
JAN 16 1935